

AUG 24 2006

Application No. 09/712042  
Page 7Amendment  
Attorney Docket No. S63.2N-6430-US03

## REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated June 27, 2006. Each issue in the official action is discussed below.

*Interview with Examiner*

On August 15, 2006, Applicant had an interview with Examiner and discussed cited reference Hamlin (US 5270086). Applicant initiated the interview to clarify certain statements in the outstanding official action. It is asserted in the final official action in support of the rejection that "Hamlin clearly discloses a melt blend product" and that "Hamlin states in the composite structure there is a tensile layer is combined by melt bonding with an inner bonding layer." According to the Examiner in the phone conversation with the undersigned, by these statements it is meant that Hamlin states that the tensile layer is melt bonded to the inner bonding layer. Applicant pointed out in the phone conversation that nowhere in Hamlin is it disclosed or taught that the tensile layer is melt bonded to the inner bonding layer. Melt bonding is only disclosed in the bonding of the inner bonding layer to other surfaces, such as a catheter shaft (50, 52). Applicant further pointed out that Hamlin does discuss bonding the tensile layer to the inner bonding layer, but only mentions using adhesive, such as in column 5, lines 67-68, where it is stated that "adhesive 66, 68 may be juxtaposed between layers 60, 62 and 64" and in claim 18, where it is stated that there may be "hot-melt adhesive layers disposed between the tensile and inner layers." In the phone conversation, the Examiner indicated that she agreed with Applicant's points and instructed Applicant to point them out in the present response to the outstanding official action.

*§102 Rejections*

Claims 19-20, 33-37, 41 and 45 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Hamlin (5270086). A full account of the rejection may be found in numbered paragraph 2 starting on page 2 of the official action.

Applicant respectfully traverses. As pointed out above, in the noted interview, Examiner indicated that she agreed that Hamlin does not disclose a melt blend product as asserted in the official action and that Hamlin does not state in the composite structure there is a tensile

*Application No. 09/712042  
Page 8*

*Amendment  
Attorney Docket No. S63.2N-6430-US03*

tensile layer combined by melt bonding with an inner bonding layer. As such, since the basis for maintaining the rejection has been shown to be incorrect, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 20, 33-37, 41 and 45, among other reasons, are similarly not anticipated by the cited reference.

*§103 Rejections.*

Claims 30-32, 38-40 and 42-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamlin (5,270,086). A full account of the rejection may be found in numbered paragraph 4 starting on page 4 of the official action.

Among other reasons, dependent claims 30-32, 38-40 and 42-44, which are dependent upon claim 19, are similarly not anticipated or obvious for the reasons stated above in response to the §102 rejection. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

*Conclusion*

The application should now be in condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore earnestly solicited. If the Examiner would like to further discuss the case, she is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

By:   
William E. Anderson II  
Registration No.: 37766

Date: August 24, 2006

6109 Blue Circle Drive, Suite 2000  
Minnetonka, MN 55343-9185  
Telephone: (952) 563-3000  
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001

f:\wp\work\weal06430us03\_amd\_20060824.doc